



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,180	04/14/2004	Shmuel Shaffer	062891.1251	6361

5073 7590 03/02/2011
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KHAI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/02/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,180	Applicant(s) SHAFFER ET AL.	
	Examiner Khai N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>WO 2004/072859 A1</u> |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on October 27, 2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features "the endpoint concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more extensions of

one or more other users" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-6, 13, 15-18, 25, 27-32, 39, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,666 hereinafter "Evans") in view of Idoni et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0264665 A1 hereinafter "Idoni").

Regarding claims 1, 15, 27, and 41, Evans teaches a system, a method (Figs. 1-4) and a computer-readable medium encoded with logic (Fig.1, 25 Random Access Memory (RAM), 35 Operating System, 36 Application Programs, etc., column 2 line 60 through column 3 line 15) for enhanced extension mobility (Fig. 2, 104, 110 Billy, Christopher, Pat, Suzie, William, 112, column 4 lines 10-14, i.e., a plurality of separate and concurrent desktops and workspaces within the shared computing environment of computer 20, wherein each desktop reads on an extension), the system comprising one or more processing units (Fig.1, 21 Processing Unit) collectively operable to:

access user input (Fig.1, Fig.3, 100 Logon Screen, 202 User Authentication) indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint (Fig.1, 20 Computer) in a shared mode (Fig.1, Fig.2, 110 Billy, Christopher, Pat, Suzie, William, column 3 lines 54-62, i.e., the user is presented with **selectable** user identifier **among multiple users**' **identifier** such as Billy, Christopher, Pat, Suzie, and William, and thus William logged on in this shared computer reads on "indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint in a shared mode") according to which the endpoint (Fig.1, 20 Computer) concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions (Fig.2, 110 Billy, Christopher, Pat, Suzie, William) of one or more other users (Figs.1-3, column 4 lines 10-14, i.e., a plurality of separate and concurrent desktops and workspaces within the shared computing environment of computer 20, wherein each desktop reads on an extension, and column 4 lines 30-32, i.e., by using a separate desktop "extension" for each user, **multiple users can be logged on the computer simultaneously**); and

in response to the user input (Figs.1-2, Fig.3, 100 Logon Screen, 202 User Authentication) indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint (Fig.1, 20 Computer) in a shared mode (Fig.1, Fig.2, 110 Billy, Christopher, Pat, Suzie, William, column 3 lines 54-56) according to which the endpoint (Fig.1, 20 Computer) concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions of one or more other users (Fig.2, 110 Billy, Christopher, Pat, Suzie, William), configure the endpoint to concurrently support an extension of the user and one or more other extensions of one or more other users (Figs. 1-3, column 4 lines 10-14, lines 30-32, and lines 46-67).

Evans clearly teaches a user input indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint in a shared mode (Figs.1-3, column 3 lines 54-62, i.e., logon area is configured for five different users, and William may begin logging by selecting either text identifier or graphical identifier). However, if it is still not clear that Evans discloses this feature, in the same field of communications technology, Idoni teaches a user input indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint in a shared mode (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 195 PC/Terminal, 120 Dedicated Telephone Device, 130 Shared Telephone Device, paragraphs [0010], [0022], [0026], and [0027] i.e., an authorized user logs-on to the desk sharing system and executes the desk sharing application via the GUI of the desk sharing application residing on the client PC 195). Idoni further teaches that the utilization of the user's standard profile

while using the shared workstation allows user to retain preferred work environment, and consequently improve overall efficiency (see Idoni – paragraph [0004]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Evans by providing the above described features such as a user input indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint in a shared mode, as taught by Idoni. The combination of the disclosures taken as a whole suggests that users would have benefited from detail techniques for an endpoint to provide concurrently support multiple users and consequently improve overall efficiency.

Regarding claims 2-3, and 28-29, Evans teaches the computer-readable medium and one or more of the processing units (Fig.1, 21 Processing Unit, 25 Random Access Memory (RAM), 35 Operating System, 36 Application Programs, etc., column 2 lines 38-50, and column 2 line 60 through column 3 line 15) are located at the endpoint (Fig. 1, 20 Computer), and are located at a server remote from the endpoint (Fig. 1, 50 Remote Computer/Server, 52 Wide Area Network, column 3 lines 21-31).

Regarding claims 4, 16, and 30, Evans discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 1, 15, and 27 above). Idoni teaches to prompt the user to select between private mode (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 120, 150 Dedicated Telephone Device, paragraph [0022], i.e., user to request the device impersonation feature of the dedicated telephone device 120 or 150, wherein dedicated telephone device reads on private mode, and paragraph [0028]) and

shared mode (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 130,135 Shared Telephone Device) at the endpoint, the selection by the user providing the user input (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 120 Dedicated Telephone Device, 130 Shared Telephone Device, paragraphs [0010], [0022], and [0026], i.e., shared telephone device 130 or 135). In addition, the feature to select between private mode and shared mode is old and well known in the art, as described in Jhanji (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126250 A1) (see Jhanji – Fig.7, Private Mode, Public Mode, Fig.8 exemplary views of the public mode and the private mode are illustrated, paragraph [0078], i.e., signing up a user, for login, for private mode and public; paragraphs [0111]-[0152], i.e., private mode, paragraphs [0153]-[0173], i.e., public “shared” mode).

Regarding claims 5, 17, and 31, Evans teaches to prompt the user to enter an extension (Figs.1-2, Fig.3 100 Logon Screen) of the user to logon at the endpoint (Fig.1, 20 Computer); access an extension entered by the user (Figs.1-2, Fig.3, 202 User Authentication); and configure the endpoint to support the entered extension (Figs.1-3, column 4 lines 44-67).

Regarding claims 6, 18, and 32, Evans teaches to prompt the user to enter a password (Fig.1, Fig.2, 114 Password Input Field) to logon at the endpoint; access a password entered by the user (); determine whether the entered password is valid (Figs.1-2, Fig.3, 202 User Authentication); and if the entered password is valid (Figs.1-

Art Unit: 2614

2, Fig.3, 204 Success?), configure the endpoint (Figs.1-2, Fig.3, 206 Desktop Already Open?) to support the entered extension (Figs.1-3, column 4 lines 44-67).

Regarding claims 13, 25, and 39, Evans discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 1, 15, and 27 above). Idoni teaches in response to the user input indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint in a private mode (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 120, 150 Dedicated Telephone Device, paragraph [0022], i.e., user to request the device impersonation feature of the dedicated telephone device 120 or 150, wherein dedicated telephone device reads on private mode, and paragraph [0028]) according to which the endpoint supports only an extension of the user, to configure the endpoint according to one or more preferences of the user (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 120 Dedicated Telephone Device, 130 Shared Telephone Device, paragraphs [0010], [0022], and [0026], i.e., shared telephone device 130 or 135). In addition, the feature to select private mode is old and well known in the art, as described in Jhanji (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126250 A1) (see Jhanji – Fig.7, Private Mode, Fig.8 exemplary views of the public mode and the private mode are illustrated, paragraph [0078], i.e., signing up a user, for login, for private mode, paragraphs [0111]-[0152], i.e., private mode).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 7-8, 10-12, 14, 19-20, 22-24, 26, 33-34, 36-38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans in view of Idoni, and in view of Sarp et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0180555 A1 hereinafter "Sarp").

Regarding claims 7, 19, and 33, Evans and Idoni disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claims 1, 15, and 27 above). However, Evans and Idoni do not explicitly disclose the detail features such as in response to an incoming phone call then indicating the extension. In the same field of communication technology, Sarp teaches in response to an incoming phone call for the user received at the endpoint (Fig. 6, 610 Receive Inbound Call to Virtual Extension Number at PBX), to indicate the extension (Fig. 6, 620 Look Up Physical Port Based on Virtual Extension Number) of the user (Fig. 6, paragraph [0045]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Evans and Idoni by providing the above described features such as in response to an incoming phone call then indicating the extension, as taught by Sarp. The combination of the disclosures taken as a whole suggests that users would have benefited from detail techniques for an endpoint to provide concurrently support multiple users with indicating the extension in response to an incoming phone call and consequently improve overall efficiency.

Regarding claims 8, 10, 20, 22, 34, and 36, Sarp teaches to display the extension of the user at a display screen (Fig. 5, 510 Display Screen) of the endpoint to indicate the phone call for the user (Fig. 1, Fig. 5, Fig. 6, paragraphs [0043]-[0045]), to play a ring tone corresponding to the extension of the user to indicate the phone call for the user (Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 5, paragraph [0035], i.e., ring style for the extension).

Regarding claims 11, 23, and 37, Sarp teaches in response to a request from the user to place an outgoing phone call from the endpoint: prompt the user to enter the extension (Fig. 4A, 420 Present Prompt for Virtual Extension Number, 430 User Inputs Virtual Extension Number) of the user prior to an outgoing phone call from the endpoint; and generate signaling data for communication with the outgoing phone call that identifies the entered extension of the user (Fig. 1, Fig. 3B, Fig. 4A, Fig. 8, 820 Look Up Virtual Extension Configuration Data Associated Physical Port, 830 Process Inputs Based on the Virtual Extension Configuration Data, paragraph [0047]).

Regarding claims 12, 24, and 38, Sarp teaches to generate signaling data for communication with every outgoing phone call from the endpoint according to a predetermined extension (Fig. 1, Fig. 3B, Fig. 8, paragraph [0047]).

Regarding claims 14, 26, and 40, Sarp teaches in response to an outgoing phone call from the endpoint, to cause one or more of one or more call detail records (CDRs) and one or more billing records to be updated to indicate a calling extension of the

Art Unit: 2614

outgoing phone call from the endpoint (Fig. 1, 125 Database Memory, 130 Provisioning Computer, Fig. 3A, paragraph [0034], i.e., records are generated for each extension and stored in the database).

5. Claims 9, 21 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans in view of Idoni, in view of Sarp, and in view of Marcus et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,933,488 hereinafter "Marcus").

Regarding claims 9, 21, and 35, Evans, Idoni, and Sarp disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7, 19 and 33). However, Evans, Idoni, and Sarp do not disclose expressly to audibly announce a name of the user to indicate the phone call for the user. Although Sarp teaches to display the information associated with the call, ringing style, and greeting style (Fig. 1, Fig. 2, paragraph [0035], and Fig. 5, paragraph [0043]).

In the same field of endeavor, Marcus discloses a system and a method to automate an announcement system (Marcus - Fig. 1 – 30 ANNOUNCEMENT SYSTEM, 32 SPEAKER, col. 3 lines 1-4) and the audible announcement of a name of the user to indicate the phone call for the user (Marcus – Fig. 1, col. 3 lines 10-14, col. 4 lines 33-40). The advantage of Marcus is additional level of security can be provided the check access and announcement access parameters (Marcus – Figs. 2-3, col. 2, lines 59-63, and col. 3 lines 15-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Evans, Idoni, and Sarp with the audible announcement of a name of the user to indicate the phone call for the user, as taught by Marcus. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification to provide additional level of security for the check access and announcement access parameters, as per the teachings of Marcus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarp et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0180555 A1 hereinafter "Sarp") in view of Eaton et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0096926 A1 hereinafter "Eaton").

Regarding claim 42, Sarp teaches a system (Figs. 1-14) for enhanced extension mobility (Figs. 3A-3B, Extensions), the system comprising one or more processing units located at an endpoint (Fig. 1, 101 Telephone System) and collectively operable to:

access user input (Fig. 4A, step 430 User Inputs virtual Extension Number) indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint (Fig. 3B, Logical/Physical Mapping Port 3) in a shared mode according to which the endpoint supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions (Fig. 3B, Virtual Extensions: 3002, 3004, 3006, 3008, User ID: Jimi, Bob, Janis, Ben, Logical/Physical Mapping: 3) of one or more other users (Fig. 1, Fig. 3B, Fig. 4A, paragraph [0036]); and

in response to the user input (Fig. 4A, step 430 User Inputs virtual Extension Number) indicating a desire of the user to logon at the endpoint in a shared mode according to which the endpoint supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions (Fig. 3B, Virtual Extensions: 3002, 3004, 3006, 3008, User ID: Jimi, Bob, Janis, Ben) of one or more other users, configure the endpoint to support an extension of the user (Fig. 4B, 460 Associate Physical Extension of Telephone with Input Virtual Extension Number) and one or more other extensions (Fig. 3B, Virtual Extensions: 3002, 3004, 3006, 3008, User ID: Jimi, Bob, Janis, Ben, Logical/Physical Mapping: 3) of one or more other users (Fig. 1, 120 Dynamic Configuration Module, Fig. 3B, Figs. 4A-4B, paragraphs [0038] and [0040]);

in response to an incoming phone call for the user received at the endpoint (Fig. 6, 610 Receive Inbound Call to Virtual Extension Number at PBX), indicate the extension (Fig. 6, 620 Look Up Physical Port Based on Virtual Extension Number) of the user (Fig. 6, paragraph [0045]);

in response to a request from the user to place an outgoing phone call from the endpoint: prompt the user to enter the extension (Fig. 4A, 420 Present Prompt for Virtual Extension Number, 430 User Inputs Virtual Extension Number) of the user prior to an outgoing phone call from the endpoint; and generate signaling data for communication with the outgoing phone call that identifies the entered extension of the user (Fig. 1, Fig. 3B, Fig. 4A, Fig. 8, 820 Look Up Virtual Extension Configuration Data Associated Physical Port, 830 Process Inputs Based on the Virtual Extension Configuration Data, paragraph [0047]).

Sarp teaches the endpoint supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions (Fig. 3B, Virtual Extensions: 3002, 3004, 3006, 3008, User ID: Jimi, Bob, Janis, Ben, Logical/Physical Mapping: 3, paragraph [0036]). However, Sarp does not explicitly disclose the endpoint concurrently supports the extensions, although the feature to concurrently support multiple users is old and well known in the art as described below in three of many classes 379 and 709 references, Yoo (WO 2004/072859 A1) teaches a multi-user support system provided in one computer and configured to support a plurality of users to independently use the computer simultaneously (see Yoo – Figs.1-5, Abstract, page 1 lines 4-7), Evans (U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,666) teaches a single computer provided a separate desktop thread for each user so that several users can be logged on simultaneously using a single computer (see Evans - Figs.1-3, Abstract, column 3 lines 54-60, and column 4 lines 30-32).

And, Eaton teaches a single endpoint can concurrently support extensions of multiple users (see Eaton – Fig.1, 26 Client Computer, paragraphs [0042]-[0043], i.e.; multiple users share the same computer and can use at the same time from the same or a variety of locations). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Sarp by providing the above described features such as a single endpoint concurrently supports multiple users, as taught by Eaton. The combination of the disclosures taken as a whole suggests that users would have benefited from detail techniques for an endpoint to provide concurrently support multiple users.

7. Claims 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans in view of Idoni, and in view of Baffes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,792 hereinafter "Baffes").

Regarding claims 43-45, Evans and Idoni disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claims 1, 15 and 27 above). Idoni further teaches to prompt the user to select between private mode (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 120, 150 Dedicated Telephone Device, paragraph [0022], i.e., user to request the device impersonation feature of the dedicated telephone device 120 or 150, wherein dedicated telephone device reads on private mode, and paragraph [0028]) and shared mode (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 130,135 Shared Telephone Device) at the endpoint, the selection by the user providing the user input (see Idoni – Fig.1, 170 Desk Sharing Server, 190 Desk Sharing Client GUI, 120 Dedicated Telephone Device, 130 Shared Telephone Device, paragraphs [0010], [0022], and [0026], i.e., shared telephone device 130 or 135). In addition, the feature to select between private mode and shared mode is old and well known in the art, as described in Jhanji (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126250 A1) (see Jhanji – Fig.7, Private Mode, Public Mode, Fig.8 exemplary views of the public mode and the private mode are illustrated, paragraph [0078], i.e., signing up a user, for login, for private mode and public, paragraphs [0111]-[0152], i.e., private mode, paragraphs [0153]-[0173], i.e., public "shared" mode).

However, Evans and Idoni do not explicitly disclose the user can be concurrently logged on at multiple endpoints. Although, the feature "the user can be concurrently logged on at multiple endpoints" is old and well known in the art (e.g., user can concurrently log on to different computers, another example is in the USPTO - an examiner can be concurrently logged on at multiple computers/workstations such as logged on the office computer/workstation and the examiner leave the computer/workstation for training, but remains logged on, and then again the examiner logs into another computer/workstation in the training laboratory). At the USPTO and many other business an employee who is logged on at work may also log on concurrently when he/she goes home (e.g., work at home). Many other examples are also available to show this the feature of concurrently logging on to different endpoints is extremely old and well known. Even at home one may log on using different computers.

In the same filed of endeavor, Baffes teaches a user can be concurrently logged on at multiple endpoints (see Baffes – Figs. 1-6, 34 USER, column 14 lines 26-36, and lines 51-58, i.e., a user logons and leaves the first computer, but remains logged on and the user goes to a second computer then again logs into this second computer), and Baffes further teaches that there is a need to provide information delivery to a user from any of multiple configurations (see Baffes – column 3, line 4 through column 4 line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the features for a user can be

Art Unit: 2614

concurrently logged on at multiple endpoints, as taught by Baffes, into the method and system of Evans and Idoni in order to enhance the extension mobility. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification to provide the information delivery to a user from any of multiple configurations, as per the teachings of Baffes.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khai N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-3141. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. N. N./

Examiner, Art Unit 2614

01/15/2011

/Ahmad F Matar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614